

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C §102**

Claims 1-5 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,889,325 to Sipman. In particular, the Examiner finds that, with regard to claim 1, Sipman discloses all of the claimed limitations. Applicants have reviewed the reference with care, paying particular attention to the passages cited, and are compelled to respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of this reference. A major difference between the presently claimed invention and the system of Sipman lies in that Sipman is concerned with the interaction of a user with a provider through a trusted server, whereas the presently claimed invention is directed to a method wherein a third party is interacting on behalf of a user (pretending, essentially, to be the user) with another, suspect, party as part of investigating that suspect party. In the spirit of cooperation and the interest of passing this case to issue, Applicants have amended claim 1 to more specifically recite the above difference and thus more clearly read over the prior art. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is in fact patentable over Sipman and request the Examiner to kindly reconsider and allow this claim.

Claims 2-3 and 8 depend from claim 1. In view of the above discussion, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable, and for this reason claims 2-3 and 8 are also allowable.

Claims 4-5 and 9-10 have been cancelled without prejudice and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present these claims in a future divisional or continuation application.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C §103**

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sipman in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,774,717 to Porcaro.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, in light of the above discussion of claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 7 are also allowable and thus are not individually addressed herein.

Regarding the prior art made of record by the Examiner but not relied upon, Applicants believe that this art does not render the pending claims unpatentable.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully urge the Examiner to pass this case to issue.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

November 8, 2005

(Date of Transmission)

Alma Smalling

(Name of Person Transmitting)




(Signature)

11/8/05

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 43,010

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300 voice

(323) 934-0202 facsimile

rpopa@ladasparry.com